DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 148 EA 013 601

AUTHOR Paddock, Susan C.; Felix, B. Lane
TITLE Synthesis: A Report on Federally Funded Training to Local Education Agencies.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Southwest Regional Center for Community Education Development.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 97p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; *Community Education; Educational Development; Federal Aid; Professional Development; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; School Districts; Self Evaluation (Groups); Training Methods; *Training Objectives
IDENTIFIERS Training Materials

ABSTRACT

From 1976 to 1980, 27 projects developed by institutions of higher education received federal funding to train local educational agency personnel in the planning and operation of community education programs. In addition, four projects were funded to train personnel at the state level and seven to develop training materials. This report examines and synthesizes information about all funded projects. Data were gathered from three sources: project proposals, final reports, and project directors' evaluations of project success. The report discusses the methods and procedures of the study; provides summaries of each project's goals, approaches to training, and results; analyzes the project directors' perceptions of the importance of 70 competencies and the degree to which they were delivered in the projects; compares a single-year project with a multiple-year project; and makes recommendations for improving training in community education. (WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SYNTHESIS

A REPORT ON FEDERALLY FUNDED TRAINING TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

SUSAN C. PADDOCK

B. LANE FELIX

A PROJECT JOINTLY SPONSORED BY
THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THE C.S. MOTT FOUNDATION
THE SOUTHWEST CENTER FOR
COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT,
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

1980

EA 013 601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION..... 1

CHAPTER II: APPROACH..... 7

CHAPTER III: ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PROPOSALS AND REPORTS.....11

CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS.....65

CHAPTER V: COMPARISON OF A SINGLE-YEAR PROJECT AND A MULTIPLE-YEAR PROJECT.....75

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....83

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I: PROJECTS FUNDED TO PROVIDE TRAINING..... 3

TABLE II:TYPE OF MATERIALS RECEIVED..... 4

TABLE III: OVERVIEW OF TRAINING PROGRAMS.....12

TABLE IV: SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS.....14

TABLE V: PROJECT DIRECTORS' SELF-ASSESSMENTS.....66

TABLE VI: COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANCE....84

TABLE VII: COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANCE...85

TABLE VIII: COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY RATINGS....88

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Community Education training by Institutions of Higher Education (IHE's) was funded under the Community Schools Act of 1974 (PL 93-380, Section 405). Funding was originally for three years, from FY'76 to FY'78; this funding under the original act was extended one year, to FY'80. The rules and regulations pertaining to training projects in IHE's specified:

> Grants...will be made to institutions of higher education to pay all or part of the costs of developing and establishing, or expanding, programs which will train persons to plan and operate community education programs.
>
> Each grant pursuant to this subpart will be for only one of the following types of projects to develop and establish, or expand: (1) Programs to train persons planning and operating community education programs in local educational agencies...; (2) programs to train persons in State educational agencies...; (3) programs (i) to assess appropriate training competencies...and (ii) to develop an appropriate training curriculum and training materials... (Sec. 160c.30)

During the four years of funding, 27 programs were funded to train local educational agency personnel; 4 programs were funded to train State educational agency personnel; and 7 programs were funded to develop training curriculum and training materials.

Since the training-to-LEA's category was the largest of the three funded areas, it demonstrated the greatest diversity in training design and content. To be sure, all 27 projects were required to reflect the following funding requirements:

1) they were to be designed "to provide training in skills and understandings with reference to each of the elements of a community education program";

2) they were to offer short-term training "at times and in such a manner as to allow participation by recipients;" and

3) they were to provide training for "eligible recipients in specific local educational agencies...on a continuing basis over the course of the grant period, with provisions for follow-up and reinforcement of specific training workshops or exercises." (Sec 160.c32)

The names of IHEs funded to provide training to LEAs, and the years in which they were funded appear in Table I.

Beyond the basic commonalities defined by the rules and regulations the funded projects had great variety. Because of this variety, the U.S. Office of Education--Office of Community Education felt a need to synthesize the projects' purposes and outcomes. This synthesis would provide, it was believed, a better understanding of fruitful directions for future funding of training in community education.

Therefore, the personnel of the Office of Community Education asked Arizona State University, during the 1980 fiscal year, to gather information about all funded projects and to develop a report synthesizing that information. Arizona State was chosen to undertake this study because the Southwest Community Education Center at the University was being funded under a training and curriculum development grant (TACD) during FY'79 to collect similar data about competency-based training in community education; the Office of Community Education felt that the competency study was compatible with the synthesis, and thus both studies could be completed with minimal additional financial resources being required. (The sum of $9,045 in direct costs was added to the original ASU budget request to cover the conduct of the synthesis and its printing and dissemination.)

TABLE I: PROJECTS FUNDED TO PROVIDE TRAINING TO LEA'S, FY 76-FY'79

NAME OF INSTITUTION	YEAR(S) FUNDED 1976-1977	1977-1978	1978-1979	1979-1980
ARIZONA				
Arizona State University				X
Pima Community College		X		
CALIFORNIA				
California State University, Sacramento		X	X	X
COLORADO				
Colorado State University	X			
FLORIDA				
Miami-Dade Community College	X	X	X	
ILLINOIS				
Chicago State University			X	
Southern Illinois University	X			
INDIANA				
Ball State University	X		X	
KENTUCKY				
Western Kentucky University		X	X	
MARYLAND				
University of Maryland				X
MICHIGAN				
Michigan State University		X	X	
MINNESOTA				
College of St. Thomas	X			
NEW MEXICO				
New Mexico State University		X		
NEW YORK				
Syracuse University	X			
OKLAHOMA				
Oklahoma State University	X			X
OREGON				
University of Oregon	X			
VIRGINIA				
University of Virginia	X	X		
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University			X	

The information which was thus obtained is shown in Table II.

TABLE II:
TYPE OF MATERIALS RECEIVED

Projects (by year)	Proposal, Final Report, Survey,	Proposal, Final Report.	Proposal, Survey.	Proposal
76-77	3	3	2	1
77-78	5	0	1	2
78-79	2	1	3	
79-80			3	1

Total Proposals Received: 27 (100%)
Total Final Reports: 14 (52%)
Total Survey Instruments: 19 (70%)

It should be noted that many of the projects funded during the last two fiscal years did not have time to complete their final reports for inclusion in this synthesis.
The data available in these materials are analyzed in Chapters III and IV.

PURPOSES

As noted above, the staff of Arizona State University--Southwest Center for Community Education Development were given broad guidelines regarding the nature of the study, e.g., that it was to examine all funded projects which provided training to LEA's, and that it was to develop a synthesis of that information which would be helpful in planning for future training. Beyond that, however, the staff were allowed to develop the study at their discretion.

The study that emerged included data from three sources: (1) the proposals of all funded projects; (2) the final reports of all funded projects (where available); and (3) self assessments for training by project directors. The self assessments were competency-based instruments which allowed for the collecting of quantitative data; these data, in combination with qualitative data from the proposals and final reports, allowed the staff to draw some conclusions about federally-funded training to local educational agencies. The purposes which guided the data collection and analysis were:

1) to describe the content and design of training projects;

2) to assess the extent to which training was delivered for competencies identified as being important; and

3) to synthesize quantitative and qualitative data in a manner to allow the staff and the readers to generalize about strong and weak areas in funded training projects and to develop recommendations concerning the content and design of future projects.

THE REPORT

This report is intended to address these three purposes and to do so in a manner which allows the reader to understand the research processes used. The report includes:

1) a description of the methods and procedures of the study (Chapter II);

2) a project-by-project summary of training approaches and content (Chapter III);

3) a summary of quantitative data about training content, as reported on project directors' competency-based self-assessment forms (Chapter IV);

4) a detailed account of two FY'80 projects--a one-year training effort (ASU) and a three-year training effort (CSU-Sacramento)--which demonstrates the effect of differing funding patterns (Chapter V); and

5) a set of conclusions and recommendations to guide policymakers and trainers in developing future training in community education (Chapter VI).

Although the report depends on information provided by numerous people in the field and in the Office of Community Education, the responsibility for the report is wholly the authors'; all opinions expressed in this report are the authors', and no offical endorsement from sponsoring organizations should be inferred.

CHAPTER II: APPROACH

This synthesis was directed at gathering information relevant to:

1. a general description of the IHE community education training projects, focusing on:
   a. goals and objectives of projects,
   b. designs for training, and
   c. reported results;
2. a determination of the community education competencies viewed as most important by trainers involved in the projects;
3. an assessment of the degree to which training in these community education competencies was delivered through these projects; and
4. a summary of conclusions covering:
   a. competencies which should be addressed in future training projects,
   b. design characteristics which should be considered by planners of future projects, and
   c. processes and procedures which seem to improve the positive results of training.

DATA COLLECTION

The following procedures were used to collect data relative to these questions:

1. In September, 1979, a letter was sent to all directors of IHE training projects describing the proposed synthesis and requesting copies of their respective proposals, final reports, and other relevant materials.

2. In October, 1979, a follow-up letter was sent to all project directors who had not yet responded to the initial request.

3. In November, 1979, the survey instrument was mailed to the project directors, along with a letter exploring the possibility of meeting individually with each project director attending the National Community Education Conference in Boston. Phone calls were then made to each project director to confirm these meetings, and nine of the 18 directors were able to attend these meetings.

4. Follow-up phone calls were made throughout the months of December, 1979, and January, February and March, 1980, in an attempt to obtain the necessary materials from the remaining project directors.

5. In April, 1980, a request was sent to the U.S. Office of Education for assistance in gathering materials from projects which had not responded.

6. In May, 1980, the U.S. Office of Education mailed duplicate instrument to all project directors who had not completed the initial survey.

The results of this data collection process appear in Table I, Chapter 1. The findings from the data collection are reported in the remainder of this synthesis.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited in several ways which affected data collection and analysis. The major limitations of the study are:

1) Incomplete data (final reports and self-assessments) were used in the study since data were not available from projects completed several years earlier, nor from projects not yet completed.

2) Insufficient data were used in the study. Originally it was intended that participants as well as project directors would respond to the training assessment instrument. However, the difficulty in identifying or locating participants, along with the experienced difficulty in receiving returns from the project directors, led to the abandonment of that part of the study design. Had trainees' perceptions been included, the study would have had greater reliability.

3) Discrepancies between goals/objectives outlined in the initial proposals and goals/objectives listed in the corresponding final reports represented several different kinds of phenomena. In some cases, the proposed project was modified substantially during the negotiation process, but those alterations were not always accounted for in the final report. In other cases, modifications in the

project were the result of situations that arose during the course of the project. It was not always possible to determine whether discrepancies in objectives and outcomes were intended (due to negotiations at the beginning of the project) or accidental (due to situation requirements). Therefore, all important deviations from original proposals were noted and included in the development of conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER III: ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PROPOSALS AND REPORTS

The projects funded through the Community School Act demonstrated, as mentioned earlier, a diversity in training design and content and in the audiences to which they were directed. While there was no clear evolution from year to year, there were some changes over time which appear to reflect the increasing sophistication of trainers. This chapter outlines the few generalizations which can be made from project proposals and reports, and presents brief descriptions of the projects.

There was an increasing tendency to offer training to persons other than those directly involved in either directing a community education program or in serving on a community advisory council. Later projects addressed themselves to agency personnel and school administrators. Furthermore, later projects began to train teams of people involved in community education, as compared to earlier projects which focused on individuals.

Program content also changed. The emphasis on general skill development, noticeable in most of the first projects, became an emphasis on specific skill areas--alliance-building for example, or planning, or citizen effectiveness. In those projects where training continued to be in general skills, the training became directed at specific population groups such as administrators and citizen councils.

Beyond these generalizations, however, very few commonalities exist. Projects were in rural and urban settings, presented on-campus and in LEA sites. Some projects did one-time sessions for a number of different groups, while other projects offered repeated sessions to the same group of people. Some projects included home-work, field and follow-up sessions, others developed materials for dissemination.

TABLE III: OVERVIEW OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Year of Funding	Name of Institution	Type of Training	Audiences	Content of Training
1976	College of St. Thomas	4-day sessions & bi-monthly 1-day seminars	New Community Education Personnel.	General Skills
	Colorado State University	3 designs: 1-week session 3-weekend sessions individualized plan	Community Education Personnel.	General Skills
	Oklahoma State University	2-day sessions 1-day seminars 3-week course field/followup visit	Community Education Personnel.	General Skills
	University of Oregon	Monthly sessions (pyramid design)	Community Education Personnel; Councils.	Process Facilitation
	Pima Community College (Arizona)	Seminars Conferences	Community Education Personnel; Instructors; Councils & Instructors.	Administrative Skills; Instructional Skills; Council Skills & Community Education Concept
	Southern Illinois University	1-Shot sessions	School Personnel (varied).	School-Community Relations
	Syracuse University (New York)	1-day sessions presentations	Community Education Personnel; School Personnel; NY School Study Council	General Skills Awareness
1977	New Mexico State University	2-week on-campus course	Community Education Personnel.	General Skills (Multi-cultural emphasis)
1973	Chicago State University (Illinois)	1-day sessions field project	Teams of Community Education-related Personnel.	Competency-based individual plans in community education skills.
	Virgina Polytechnic Institute	1 session and 8 conferences (ripple effect)	Community Education Personnel.	Alliance Building

TABLE III (continued)

1979	Arizona State University	1-day sessions and homework	Teams of Community Education-related Personnel.	Planning
	University of Maryland	1-day sessions	Citizens; Agency Personnel.	Citizen Effectiveness
	Oklahoma State University	5-day sessions 2-day sessions 1-day sessions followup sessions	Community Education Personnel; School Board Members; Administrators; Citizen Volunteers.	General Skills
1976 & 1977	Ball State University (Indiana)	training session and followup	Community Education Personnel; Community Residents; School Board Members.	General Skills
1977-1979	California State University (Sacramento)	Internship	Graduate Students.	General Skills
1976-1978	Miami-Dade ommunity College	1-day sessions Core courses forums laboratory approach	Citizens.	Leadership Community-building Community probelm-solving
1977-1978	Michigan State University	Monthly session	Principals; Assistant Superintendents.	General Skills
1976-1977	University of Virginia	5-day summer institute and cluster groups	Community Education Personnel; Agencies; Citizens.	General Skills
1977-1978	Western Kentucky University	1 day sessions and inservice; seminars	Community Education Personnel.	General Skills

TABLE IV: SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF T-LOCAL PROJECTS

NAME OF INSTITUTION	ONE-DAY TRAINING SESSIONS	PERSONNEL ONLY	GENERAL SKILLS TRAINING ONLY
College of St. Thomas (76)		X	X
Colorado St. Univ. (76)		X	X
Oklahoma State Univ. (76)		X	X
University of Oregon (76)	X		
Pima Comm. College (76)	X		
South. Illinois Univ. (76)	X		
Syracuse University (76)	X		X
New Mexico St. Univ. (76)		X	X
Chicago St. Univ. (78)	X	X	X
Virginia Poly. Inst. (78)		X	
Arizona St. Univ. (79)	X		
University of Maryland (79)	X		
Oklahoma St. Univ. (79)			X
Ball State Univ. (76)	X		X
Ball State Univ. (77)	X		X
Cal. State Univ. (77)		X	
Cal. State Univ. (78)		X	
Cal. State Univ. (79)		X	
Miami-Dade Comm. Coll. (76)			
Miami-Dade Comm. Coll. (77)			
Miami-Dade Comm. Coll. (78)			
Michigan St. Univ. (77)	X		X
Michigan St. Univ. (78)	X		X
University of Virginia (76)		X	X
University of Virginia (77)		X	X
Western Kentucky Univ. (77)		X	X
Western Kentucky Univ. (78)		X	X

Total number of Projects* with One-Day Sessions Only	11	(41%)
Total number of Projects* Training only Community Education Personnel	13	(48%)
Total number of Projects* offering General Skills Training Only	15	(56%)

*Multi-year projects are counted as multiple projects.

A qualitative review of the projects, then,gives us a welter of activities and approaches. These are summarized in Tables III and IV. The tables are followed by brief descriptions of the projects which were developed from proposals and available final reports.* More careful quantitative analysis and indepth descriptions of two projects are presented in Chapters IV and V, so as to paint a clearer picture of federally-funded community education training.

---

* It should be noted that the description of the goals/objectives, design, and results of the projects are those reported by project directors. In some cases results were not available for this analysis, In addition, in some projects, results may not reflect original goals completely because those goals were altered during the negotiation process; those alterations were not always reported either formally (in final reports) or informally (through conversations with project directors).

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: 1976 PROJECTS

College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)
Colorado State University
Oklahoma State University
Pima Community College (Arizona)
Southern Illinois University
Syracuse University
University of Oregon

Project Title: The Upper Midwest Community Education Director Training Project (1976)

Institution: College of St. Thomas

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

To develop a corps of trained community education personnel within a five-state area who possess the conceptual, technical and human skills associated with constructive and effective community education program development.

DESIGN:

(1) Operate two four-day workshops to train 50 new community education directors.

(2) Offer bi-monthly one-day seminars at 13 different locations throughout the five states to provide reinforcement for the 50 new directors plus an opportunity for 150 other experienced directors to upgrade their skills in need areas they identify.

(3) Develop a video-tape library of five seminar presentations to share with districts.

(4) Expand community education print and media resources available through the community education center for training.

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) Three workshops trained a total of 84 new directors.

(2) 65 seminars in five states served 1036 participants; six IHE's cooperated; there were problems in communicating with outlying districts.

(3) The seminars were too long to be condensed to one-hour tapes so tapes were made of simulated sessions covering the most important content of the seminars.

(4) Budgeting problems and shifting priorities precluded any success on expanding resources available at the community education center.

Project Title: Project Choice (1976)

Institution: Colorado State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To maximize short-term training opportunities in community education by giving participants a choice of three different delivery models from which to obtain training.

(2) To conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis of three different delivery methods.

DESIGN:

(1) Offer one week training, three weekends of training and individualized training programs to 25, 25, and 15 participants respectively.

(2) Collect pre- and post-data on knowledge, feelings and opinions of participants; cost of programs; attendance and related administrative information

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) Week-long training was found to be most effective; however, data indicated that weekend sessions were scheduled too early in the year to be convenient for most people; individual program participants did not stay on task.

(2) Weekend workshops were most expensive but resulted in most learning; individual program was least expensive but resulted in the least learning; all delivery systems were equal on other variables.

(3) Problems: Weekend workshops need to be publicized well in advance; individualized programs' participants need to be kept in constant and direct contact with training staff, which requires travel and phone budget. Follow-ups are needed on retention of training impact, which should be figured into cost-effectiveness.

Project Title: Comprehensive Community Education Training Program for Personnel in Kansas and Oklahoma (1976)

Institution: Oklahoma State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

To provide optimum learning experiences for individuals specifically responsible for the planning, implementation and operation of community education programs and activities in Kansas and Oklahoma to improve their ability to:

(1) Develop a verbal or written philosophy of community education;

(2) Identify resources and facilities in the community;

(3) Develop planning, implementation and operation rationale for local community education programs;

(4) Develop patterns of funding for local community education programs;

(5) Develop local public information programs;

(6) Organize volunteer programs in community education;

(7) Develop community goals and establish community priorities;

(8) Effect cooperation between community agencies and organizations;

(9) Develop a plan for building and program supervision.

DESIGN:

(1) Conduct two regional two-day workshops each in Kansas and Oklahoma (on 7, 2, 5, 8, 3).

(2) Conduct six one-day seminars each, in two states (on 4, 3, 9).

(3) Conduct/arrange two field visits each in two states.

(4) Make ten follow-up visits each to locations where seminars were held.

(5) Conduct 15 on-site orientation seminars each in two states on the community education philosophy.

(6) Conduct one three-week course at universities in two states (on 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9).

Project Title: A Community Approach to Community School Personnel Development (1976)

Institution: Pima Community College

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To provide training to community school coordinators and supervisors to upgrade their administrative skills, assessment of community needs, evaluation techniques, and supervisory techniques.

(2) To provide training to community school instructors to upgrade skills in instructional techniques, curriculum development, presentation, evaluation, and philosophy of education.

(3) To provide training to community school advisory council members in the philosophy of community education, program planning, community school relations, and administrative skills.

(4) To hold a mini-conference on community education for day school people, renewing their commitment to community education.

(5) To publish results of conference in document for distribution to community and day school personnel and to the general public.

DESIGN:

(1) Eight two-hour sessions on community needs assessments, administrative skills, supervisory techniques, and evaluation techniques.

(2) Six two-hour sessions on instructional techniques, curriculum development and presentation, class evaluation techniques.

(3) Four two-hour sessions on program planning and developing and strengthening community/school relations.

(4) General workshop on philosophy of community education for all participants.

(5) Certified course in community education for all participants.

(6) Conference with topics: definition of community education; responsibilities of community educators; needs analysis; coordinatior efforts; boundaries; marketing community education; training of personnel.

Project Title: Community Education Training for Local Community Education Personnel in Metro-East Illinois (1976)

Institution: Southern Illinois University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To make available technical assistance to selected school boards and agency boards of directors in Metro-East communities to enable them to identify needs and solve policy problems related to community education.

(2) To provide awareness and skill development training to management personnel in these districts in the identification of needs and the solution of administrative problems related to collaborative program planning and implementation.

(3) To provide management personnel with training and staff development experiences related to interagency cooperation.

(4) To provide workshops, conferences, and technical assistance to human service agency program and building administrators related to school-community relations and cooperative program planning and development.

DESIGN:

(1) Conduct a planning workshop for persons in selected districts on identification and analysis of school-community relations problems.

(2) Conduct summer workshops for central office personnel, school faculties, students, and community representatives on improving school-community relations.

(3) Conduct inservice education sessions for members of staffs of participating schools and agencies on school-community relations skills.

(4) Train local district personnel and social service agencies in developing guidelines and procedures designed to marshall community interest in and support for school programs of instruction and auxiliary services.

(5) Train LEA and agency personnel in developing guidelines and procedures for effective dissemination of information.

(6) Collect, evaluate, and disseminate written and other types of materials and information relating to school-community relations programs.

(7) Conduct three regional planning conferences for other smaller selected districts to help them identify their most urgent school-community relations problem.

(8) Assist these small districts in offering training sessions on school-community relations programs during the districts' required pre-school inservice education weeks.

(9) Provide training sessions for key personnel involved with community-school programs which address each district's specific problems.

(10) Assist districts in conducting various kinds of inter-system school-community relations projects.

Project Title: Training for Local Community Education Personnel (1976)

Institution: Syracuse University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

To identify and develop short-term training programs for specified New York educators planning and operating community education programs in local education agencies.

DESIGN:

(1) Community educators representing model sites will receive training at ten one-day workshops at various sites.

(2) These community educators will demonstrate an increased knowledge and understanding of technical skills, of human skills, and of conceptual skills in community education.

(3) Members of the Central New York School Study Council (90 districts) will attend one day-long workshop on the concept of community education.

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) Five one-day and one two-day workshops were held.

(2) Training was offered on needs assessment, evaluation, interagency/ intergovernmental cooperation, organizing community education and future directions for community education.

(3) The workshop for the Study Council was not held but the Center made four presentations and conducted one help session at the Association's state meeting; three additional workshops on awareness of community education were conducted for school personnel and other interested persons.

(4) A newsletter was circulated to 500 people; in addition, brochures and informational flyers were sent to IHE's, LEA's, educational administrators and citizen groups within 75 miles of the training activities; also, participants in workshops developed a telephone communication network among themselves.

(5) A seven-member advisory committee to assist the project was established.

(6) A cooperative effort for technical assistance and information sharing among LEA's, New York State Department of Education and the Center was developed; this network led to hiring a full-time community education coordinator at the state level; six consortium leaders were asked to serve as regional representatives for community education in various areas of the state.

(7) A conference on community education for university personnel was held.

Project Title: Community Education Training to Local Educational Agencies (1976)

Institution: University of Oregon

GOALS/OBJECTIVES

(1) To build the capacity of the University of Oregon, Northwest Community Education Development Center.

(2) To provide process facilitation skill training to local coordinators and directors.

(3) To test the assumption that a process orientation to community education in-service training is possible and has utility to local community education personnel within the limitations of their current resources.

DESIGN:

(1) Train key Community Education leaders from several districts in skills related to groups working to get tasks done (process facilitation skills), and in competencies related to skill transfer.

(2) Assist local coordinators/directors in developing additional skills in involving local people in problem-solving, communications, planning and decision-making (and in building these local people's skills for engaging in these functions) as these relate to operating community education programs.

(3) Train local community education advisory councils or other groups in group process skills, awareness and attitudes, assisting them in using these to solve local problems and meet local priorities for community education efforts.

(4) Test a training plan for delivering process-related skills, knowledge and sensitivities to multiple community education service clients.

(5) Gather data concerning both intended effects and unexpected effects of the project on regional community education center personnel and functions; on key community education leaders who served as trainers; on local community education programs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: 1977 PROJECTS

New Mexico State University

Project Title: A Multi-Cultural Training for Community Education Leaders of New Mexico and West Texas (1977)

Institution: New Mexico State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To enable trainees to conduct community needs assessments.

(2) To equip trainees with fundamentals of community education.

(3) To enable trainees to develop and mobilize community resources for educational program support.

(4) To enable trainees to conduct effective dissemination activities.

(5) To equip trainees with tricultural sensitivity skills.

(6) To equip trainees with lay participation in educational decision making skills.

(7) To equip trainees with program evaluation skills.

DESIGN:

(1) Select 20 trainees from community education programs in New Mexico and West Texas.

(2) Conduct two-week on-campus instruction in community education skills

(3) Arrange for each participant to complete an implementation practicum in his/her own LEA, with regular supervision by center/project staff (graduate credit will be given).

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) During a two-week workshop, extensive instruction and hands-on experiences were provided for participants in each of the seven topic areas; participants worked on group projects to be implemented in their own communities.

(2) Summative evaluation data supported the effectiveness of the training.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: 1978 PROJECTS

Chicago State University (Illinois)
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Project Title: Inservice Training Program for Planners and Operators of Community Education Programs (1978)

Institution: Chicago State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To provide in-service training on a continuous basis to community education planners and operators in the Chicago area.

(2) To incorporate into the ITP community education needs identified by participating communities.

(3) To offer community education training which is individually prescribed for each participant in the project.

(4) To provide community-based learning activities which may be of direct benefit to the community education needs of the participants' communities.

(5) Sub-objectives:

(a) To evaluate the effectiveness of the project;

(b) To disseminate information about the project as a prototype for similar projects;

(c) To expand the capacity of CSU for the training of community educators.

DESIGN:

(1) A minimum of thirty participants from a minimum of six LEA's will attend nine training sessions; these training sessions will provide individually prescribed programs to meet the needs of each LEA team as they relate to the topic of the session; each of the participants (of teams) will design and implement a field-based community education project designed to meet a need identified in one of the early sessions.

(2) Internal and external evaluations will be conducted and reported.

(3) Faculty at CSU involved in the project will develop a proposal for an M.S. in Education with a major in community education.

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) Thirty participants from ten LEA's participated; the size of the teams varied from one to seven members.

(2) All teams completed needs assessments of their communities.

(3) All participants did an assessment of their competencies in community education which formed the basis for designing individual improvement plans.

(4) All teams completed their field-based projects; these projects allowed application of learning.

(5) Products included a description of the program; newspaper articles, letters and other materials related to the project; a brochure describing a training program model.

(6) Proposal for community education major was written and submitted for administrative approval.

(7) Much of the success of the teams was attributed to the development of close working relationships with the decision-makers of the district and project people.

(8) Another plus was the active role of the participants in designing and facilitating the monthly sessions.

(9) There was a need to recruit team members from community groups other than schools (e.g., have interagency teams).

(10) Non-team members of the community should work with the team in planning and implementing the field-based projects in order to increase the impact of these projects in the community and to expand the learning experience for the team members.

Project Title: Inservice Training for Interdiciplinary Program in Community Education in Inner City, Rural and Suburban Settings (1978)

Institution: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To provide training that focuses on the skills necessary to build a strong alliance between community schools, community resource agencies, and citizens helping communities solve their problems.

(2) To help three local model alliances develop in each service area.

DESIGN:

(1) Initiate and implement a participant identification process in each of the eight service areas of the Mid-Atlantic region.

(2) Plan and conduct a 2-day Regional Alliance for Community Training conference, focusing on developing skills in problem-solving, team-building, communications and community education processes.

(3) Assist participants in planning Alliance training programs in each of the eight service areas.

(4) Plan and conduct conferences in each of the eight service areas.

(5) Select three demonstration communities in each service area (rural, urban, suburban) to conduct local Alliance training conferences.

(6) Conduct three local Alliance conferences in each of eight service areas.

(7) Conduct a 5-day regional Alliance institute to review progress and products, and to provide further in-depth training in alliance development in the Mid-Atlantic region.

(8) Conduct an evaluation of the project.

(9) Disseminate the results of the Alliance for Community Training local demonstration conferences.

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) Regional Alliance for Community Training conference involved 67 participants (of 80 identified).

(2) Local Alliance conferences involved 639 participants in 6 service areas.

(3) Five local demonstration conferences were held, involving 113 participants.

(4) A 4-day institute was held, involving 140 participants.

(5) Materials distributed to national Centers for Community Education and the national Community Education Clearinghouse.

(6) Weather and last-minute schedule conflicts accounted for absences.

(7) Two service areas were not involved due to staffing changes.

(8) One demonstration conference was cancelled due to time constraints and scheduling conflicts.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: 1979 PROJECTS

Arizona State University
Oklahoma State University
University of Maryland

36

Project Title: Training for Planning in Community Education (1979)

Institution: Arizona State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To utilize training methodologies which lead to long-term, self-sufficient training programs at the local level.

(2) To incorporate a planning perspective in community education programming within a framework which links concepts and strategies through a leadership component.

DESIGN:

(1) Teams of district administrators involved in community education will receive intensive training in planning concepts and strategies, will develop a general three-year management plan for community education in their districts, and will be trained in planning management systems for the components of community education.

(2) Each team will have a completed plan by the end of the year and will be prepared to develop additional plans and train others in the concepts and strategies of planning by the end of the year.

(3) Project staff will work with additional SEA's and state community education associations to implement a planning approach.

(4) Monograph on training for planning in community education and implementing a planning approach will be written by project staff and distributed nationally.

Project Title: (1979)

Institution: Oklahoma State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES

(1) To develop and demonstrate a multi-institutional/ agency framework for providing comprehensive short-term community education training in Arkansas and Oklahoma;

(2) To increase the awareness, knowledge, and skills of key leaders in a multi-state area with regard to concept, process, planning, developing, and implementing community education programs.

DESIGN:

(1) Organize an eleven-member advisory council which will meet a minimum of three times between July 1, 1979 and June 30, 1980, to assist with planning and evaluating the project; Staff the project with the project directors and four graduate students who are majoring in community education.

(2) Provide four five-day intensive training workshops for 120 community education coordinators and directors of new community education programs from Arkansas, Oklahoma, and surrounding states.

(3) Provide three quarterly statewide follow-up workshops each in Arkansas and Oklahoma for a minimum of 150 community education coordinators and directors from Arkansas and Oklahoma.

(4) Provide four two-day intensive training workshops for directors and coordinators of existing Arkansas and Oklahoma community education programs.

(5) Provide four two-day intensive training sessions in community education for 120 school board members and and administrators from Arkansas and Oklahoma on a regional basis.

(6) Provide 30 intensive one-day training sessions for 600 local residents in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

(7) Provide one five-day training session for 50 volunteers from a multi-state area in Arkansas.

(8) Provide four two-day short-term training sessions in community education for 140 institutional/agency personnel in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Project Title: Citizens' Effectiveness Training (1979)

Institution: University of Maryland

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) Development of a Citizens' Effectiveness Training (CET) Program for chairpersons of citizen advisory groups and agency professionals directly responsible for the function of: (a) the School-Community Centers Program; (b) the Multi-Service Centers Program; and (c) other professionals concerned with effective citizen participation in community affairs.

(2) Provide training to professionals working with the School-Community Centers program, the Multi-Service Centers Program, and other school-based programs with citizen advisory input as suggested by state and federal guidelines.

(3) Develop a CET package suitable for dissemination and use by community educators and other human service professionals working with citizen advisory groups.

DESIGN:

(1) (a) Hire Project Coordinator; (b) Establish a CET advisory committee; (c) develop CET package; (d) conduct CET pilot training; (e) review and revise CET package.

(2) Plan and conduct five CET programs.

(3) Compile materials for Training Guide; disseminate Training Guide.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: MULITIPLE YEAR PROJECTS

Ball State University (Indiana) 1976-1977
California State University, Sacramento 1977-1979
Miami-Dade Community College (Florida) 1976-1978
Michigan State University 1977-1978
University of Virginia 1976-1977
Western Kentucky University 1977-1978

40

Project Title: Community Education Training Project (1976)

Institution: Ball State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To provide indepth training assistance to local education agency (LEA) communities that are developing comprehensive community education projects.

(2) To determine the effectiveness of training methods.

(3) To determine the effectiveness of the community education projects of the LEAs.

(4) To determine the degree to which community education enhances the life of a community.

DESIGN:

450 persons from four communities will receive training. They will include representatives of school boards, policy-making groups, administrative personnel responsible for implementing community education, leaders of community agencies participating in cooperative community education efforts, and community leaders, as well as interested community members.

Project Title: Ten-Community Comprehensive LEA Training (1977)

Institution: Ball State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

(1) To increase the quantity and quality of each of the eight basic elements of community education.

(2) To have members of four functional groups in each community demonstrate increased cognitive awareness and improved skills related to the eight basic areas.

(3) To have communities receiving training attain a higher percent of success in achieving their goals than communities not receiving training.

(4) To have community education staff in each community demonstrate mastery of 80% of the skills related to their positions.

(5) To have policy-making groups in each community identify their decisions as policy, implementation, or maintenance with 90% accuracy.

(6) To have community leaders actively support community education by using specific skills taught during the training.

(7) To have agency personnel engage in more collaborative acts during the last quarter of the training year than during the first quarter.

DESIGN:

(1) Develop training specifically prescriptive for each of ten communities which will relate to the improvement of the eight basic elements of community education.

(2) Establish ten demonstration training sites in four states to train at least 1500 people from the following groups: (a) school board members; (b) administrators of community education; (c) community agency leaders; and (d) key community leaders.

(3) Conduct long-range study on the effects of the training using a pre-test/post-test/control group design.

REPORTED RESULTS:

(1) In eight out of nine communities that participated the community attitudes toward community education became more positive, the community broadened its educational role for the the school, and developed a more accurate perception of what was actually occurring in the community.

(2) There was great progress in awareness and knowledge and some skill improvement.

(3) Six of nine communities made substantial progress on accomplishing goals.

(4) The skill level of staff improved in seven communities; in six communities, some activity occurred in each of the eight areas.

(5) Decisions made by communities were appropriate for improving community education 95% of the time; groups in six out of nine communities made progress in identifying and using group dynamics and communication skills; four communities had sessions on policy decision-making; only one community provided training in allocation of resources.

(6) One community trained leaders in identifying and using various methods of support for community education; training in other communities emphasized awareness.

(7) Four communities had sessions on communication and conflict management.

Project Title: Demonstrated Educational Action/Project I. D. E. A. (1977, 1978, 1979)

Institution: California State University, Sacramento

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

1977

(1) To develop a graduate program in community education.

(2) To establish a teacher training facility in a community school.

(3) To bring together resources of community and university.

(4) To assess the effectiveness of a community education program on community members.

(5) To provide research data on community education for communities and universities.

(6) To examine the influence of community education on academic performance.

(7) To develop and disseminate information and materia about this model to other agencies.

(8) To provide in-service training for LEA's.

1978

(1) To provide in-service training for LEA's.

(2) To develop a graduate program in community education.

(3) To develop a demonstration community education laboratory.

(4) To integrate the resources of the community and the university.

(5) To assess the effects of community education on the community.

(6) To provide research data on community education for other agencies and institutions.

(7) To assess the relationship between community education and academic performance.

(8) To develop and disseminate information about this model to other agencies.

1979

(1) To train twenty individuals to fill leadership positions in community education.

(2) To provide an opportunity for persons to pursue graduate study in community education.

(3) To expand the awareness of local school personnel with regard to community education.

(4) To improve skills of school administrators in involving community members in the schools.

(5) To increase the effectiveness and quality of parent and community involvement in local schools.

(6) To share information about community education and the project I.D.E.A. training model.

(7) To coordinate and maximize the training resources available to local community schools and non-profit agencies involved in community education.

(8) To utilize senior citizens in the accomplishment of stated objectives.

(9) To improve contacts between members of the university and the community.

(10) To improve the skills of youth to participate effectively in their schools.

(11) To enhance the skills of staff members in federally-funded LEA's in California.

(12) To model the community education process in the implementation of the training process.

(13) To train a cadre of educational administrators and parents in the commonalities and diversities which exist between and within groups of the target population.

DESIGN:

1977

(1) Train twenty interns as community school planners/administrators; write a curriculum for community education classes.

(2) Identify and establish a community school site.

(3) Assess available resources in university and community; develop resource bank; plan for university classes to be taught in the community (including training by university personnel of community advisory boards); train community members in needs assessment techniques; conduct community needs assessment; develop community education programs to meet identified needs.

(4) Organize community school advisory board; plan and set up community education program.

(5) Train interns in research techniques; design and conduct research studies; analyze data for use in modifying community education practices and procedures; disseminate results to other agencies.

1978

(1) Design and conduct in-service training sessions as requested.

(2) Select twenty students to participate in master's program in community education; develop a community education curriculum.

(3) Identify site and design components of the lab.

(4) Conduct a needs assessment; develop a resource bank; have graduate classes taught at sites in the community; provide university training for advisory boards; publicize university events within the community; provide training in needs assessment for interns and community school personnel; conduct community needs assessment; match resources of university with needs of community; develop community education programs to meet identified needs.

(5) Develop community education activities which complement on-going classroom activities.

(6) Train interns in research design; design and conduct research studies; investigate the relationship between academic performance of students who do and who do not participate in community education programs; assess effects of participation in community education on high risk students; disseminate results.

(7) Develop written materials, conferences and workshops covering all aspects of this model for IHE's, LEA's and other agencies.

1979

(1) Develop a community-based training facility; train twenty individuals for leadership positions; and offer graduate credit to those interested.

(2) Continue program of graduate study in community education; provide university faculty support for persons in program; award master's degree in education with community education focus upon completion.

(3) Disseminate information about community education concepts and the availability of training resources to local school district personnel; demo - strate how various components of the community education concept can be utilized in school districts.

(4) Improve the skills of administrators in facilitating the parent involvement process; improve communication and understanding between parents and administrators.

(5) Develop three model community-based task forces to define training needs; oversee process and evaluate; increase the number of volunteer hours at designated target schools by 25%; train twenty "community participation leaders" who will be responsible for conducting the community involvement effort at the target schools; train twenty "community trainers" who will be responsible for conducting community involvement training; bring together participants from three model schools to critique their training experience and to make recommendations.

(6) Publish a bi-monthly newsletter; disseminate end-of-the-year brochure highlighting model.

(7) Provide information about available training and educational activities to LEA's and non-profit agencies; formalize linkages with other related training sources; offer jointly sponsored training activities.

(8) Integrate senior citizens into the community training program; increase knowledge of senior citizens concerning community education concept.

(9) Sponsor Community Education classes at local schools and community agencies; expose community members to the university; make university resources available to local communities.

(10) Enhance skill level of elementary, junior high and high school students necessary for involvement in their schools.

(11) Provide training in project management and delivery of services to federally-funded LEA's.

(12) Develop and use the input received from the Project Advisory Council; provide training activities based upon specifically-stated needs; utilize members of the community as training resource personnel.

(13) Incorporate in the instructional environment activities and materials related to the native culture of students; increase understanding of the effects of basic cultural variables on learning; help students in value clarification activities; help students to communicate effectively in both home and school.

REPORTED RESULTS (1977):

(1) Too little time for recruitment; no established standards for screening applicants; one-year program impractical (modified to two years); internship hours reduced from 15 to 11; field-sites included more than just community schools; no orientation of on-site supervisors; no local involvement with on-site seminars.

(2) Project not adequately assessed due to expansion to ten sites.

(3) Resource bank completed near end of school year, therefore not used in classrooms; no structure for keeping information on university activities; no presentations to other departments of university on community education other than College of Education; not enough time for interns to conduct needs assessment; too many communities involved; no time to proceed with matching university resources to community needs.

(4) Too many schools involved, and two did not have advisory councils so it did not seem feasible to set them up after the fact.

(5) Since program was expanded to two years, most interns did not begin their research projects.

(6) Since there was no demonstration school, nothing was done regarding this objective.

(7) Few teachers or school administrators participated.

Project Title: Institute for Urban Community Education (1976, 1977, 1978)

Institution: Miami-Dade Community College

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

1976

(1) To establish a short-term community education training program operative in a multi-ethnic urban setting:
   (a) To design and conduct a training program;
   (b) To develop and write procedural guidelines describing implementation of this model and disseminate this information;
   (c) To assist the community in understanding the various ethnic cultures in the county through the use of a multi-ethnic impact team.

1977

(1) To establish a Citizens College as a bilingual training program, providing sixteen workshops on processes and structures of the Dade County community.

(2) To improve communications in the community by (a) providing advisory services to community schools; (b) providing consultant services to the community school advisory board in the promotion of community education concepts; (c) publicizing community education activities in Dade County; and (d) maintaining the multi-cultural impact team.

1978

(1) To involve a broad coalition of citizens' groups, public and private institutions, individuals, and organizations active in community education in a short-term community education program that identifies and acts in relation to the goals, problems, and solutions of a neighborhood.

(2) To involve a representative cross-section of citizens from the multi-ethnic subgroups of Dade County in the program.

(3) To develop a training and resource process for the citizens interested in community education that utilizes the laboratory method to solve identified community problems.

(4) To foster direct communication between government and community education.

(5) To develop a county-wide Community Education Citizen Action conference to promote sharing of program results between multi-cultural neighborhoods.

(6) To design and implement a comprehensive information dissemination plan for local and national duplication of the positive features of the proposed program plan.

DESIGN:

1976

(1) Thirty one-day workshops (two sessions, morning and afternoon) for 25 persons.

(2) Multi-cultural impact team: project director plus a series of volunteer speakers; presentations prepared in response to requests by community groups for information on various topics.

1977

(1) Select five representative multi-ethnic neighborhoods for participation in planning phase of the project; secure the participation from 75% of the mayors and city managers in the area; secure participation of fifty members of Citizen Advisory Councils or other interested persons; obtain commitment for support, cooperation and resources from 75% of civic, fraternal, and service organizations in neighborhoods.

(2) Develop a program in minimum of five representative neighborhoods.

(3) In each neighborhood: develop a core of 25 community education participants to generate community support for project; conduct organizational/problem identification workshop; guide each task force in the development of potential strategies; address identified problems; conduct a follow-up workshop leading to selection of at least one strategy,

have 80% of participants demonstrate an understanding of practical methods and techniques for problem solving; provide training and resource support for each community in implementing problem solution; select one neighborhood and establish a community education block organizing program which will engage at least 80% of the workshop participants.

(4) Provide a learning experience in community education decision-making for at least 25% of the elected office holders in each municipality; disseminate to 75% of the office holders in the county information on community education citizen action programs and suggested solutions to neighborhood problems.

(5) Have two representatives from each community attend county-wide conference.

(6) Complete six 15-minute video process cassettes detailing methodology employed in the program; develop a workbook suggesting a way to implement problem-solving community education methods; secure thirty minutes of TV time and thirty minutes of radio time for programming targeted toward community education citizen dialogue with policy makers each month.

1978

(1) 100 individuals will participate in a series of non-credit core courses exploring community structure; 200 citizens will participate in a series of eight agency forums to explore leadership in relation to the community.

(2) 30 Community school directors will use the advisory services to improve communication skills.

(3) Two bulletins will be published.

(4) The multicultural impact team will function as a facilitator for all activities.

REPORTED RESULTS:

1976

(1) Twelve workshops were held for 533 persons; 14 people attended more than four workshops; 26 people attended three or more; 56 attended two or more.

(2) Procedural guidelines were developed and disseminated.

(3) Paid project assistants conducted needs assessments in various communities and developed supplemental workshops for assisting community members with specified needs; recruited participants for workshops; conducted follow-up telephone surveys on workshops and other information.

(4) Paid project assistants were substitited for volunteers because the latter proved unreliable; the actual activities of the impact team were redefined to include providing direction and supplemental information for workshops as well as recruitment of participants and follow-up activities.

Project Title: Mainlining Community Education: An Inservice Training Program for Elementary School Principals (1977)

Training Elementary School Principals in Community Education (1978)

Institution: Michigan State University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

1977

(1) To refine a model for mainlining community education using the elementary principal as the primary facilitator interrelating the family, community and school.

(2) To identify the conceptual, human, and technical skills necessary for elementary principals to effectively administer a community education program.

(3) To retrain elementary principals in those identified skills, using three alternative training programs.

(4) To develop an in-basket simulation for community education skills based on UCEA's Monroe City simulation.

(5) To assess three alternative models for retraining elementary principals in identified skills.

(6) To publish a retraining handbook for college and community education personnel responsible for training school principals.

(7) To conduct a training session for college personnel on program models identified as successful.

1978

(1) To refine the 1977-78 training model using elementary school principals as the primary participants.

(2) To assess the skill development of principals in the 1978-79 program as compared to that of principals trained in 1977-78.

(3) To develop five independent training packages which could be used to provide inservice training to districts.

(4) To provide instruction to eight assistant superintendents from participating districts to assist their project trainees in training other staff members.

(5) To assess the performance of participants whose superintendents have been involved in training as compared to those whose superiors were not involved.

(6) To develop an in-basket simulation for assessing comunity education skills based on the UCEA Monroe County simulation.

DESIGN:

1977

(1) Identify thirty principals to participate in three different retraining models, finalize model for mainlining community education and identify conceptual, human, and technical skills needed to carry out model.

(2) Develop specific training components interrelating school, family and community.

(3) Identify ten principals as summer externs to meet for a two-week workshop during summer 1977 and a one-week workshop during summer 1978; ten principals (winter externs) will participate in both workshops plus 1½-day skills-building sessions to be held monthly; ten principals (interns) will attend all of the above plus biweekly, day-long laboratory/seminar sessions.

(4) Develop simulation.

(5) Investigate feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the three training programs.

(6) Develop a handbook and distribute 500 copies to colleges of education, state and federal government, and regional cooperating centers for community education development.

(7) Conduct three-day invitational workshop for fifty professors of administration and directors of regional and cooperating community education development centers from across the country to disseminate the results of the project.

1978

(1) Refine model from previous year; select new participants; secure a commitment from resource persons; develop pre-and post-assessment instruments.

(2) Collect data and analyze results.

(3) Evaluate materials and processes from both years; select "best" components; assemble learning packages keyed to assessment instrument.

(4) Develop and conduct four one-day training sessions for assistant superintendents on the nature of the principals' training, necessary follow-up, strategies for planning, implementing and evaluating local training programs.

(5) Collect and analyze data on participants' performance.

(6) Develop an in-basket simulation for assessing community education skills based on the UCEA Monroe County simulation.

REPORTED RESULTS:

1977

(1) A model was developed and thirty principals were selected for participation; the logistics of three separate programs prevented implementation of the project as originally proposed, so a program was developed which involved principals in nine monthly sessions.

(2) Skills were identified through an assessment of participants' reactions.

(3) Simulation was not completed due to lack of money and technical expertise available to the project staff.

(4) The model was evaluated by pre- and post-tests administered to participants measuring competencies in identified skills; additional assessments were completed by each participant's supervisor; and additional instrument (questionaire) was completed by each participant at the close of the project; a final debriefing session was held with the participants.

(5) Retraining handbook was not included in the project due to lack of funds.

(6) College personnel training session was not included in the project due to lack of funds.

1978

(1) The model was broadened to increase the emphasis on concepts of community education and parent-community involvement.

(2) Nine monthly workshops were held; the principals participating in the workshops were given pre- and post-tests measuring the degree of proficiency in conceptual, human, and technical skills; the instrument also was completed by each participant's supervisor.

(3) Reports were prepared for each workshop including a summary statement and agenda.

(4) Eight assistant superintendents from the 18 participating districts were randomly selected to participate in training sessions analyzing the nature of the principals' tasks and training; superintendents held follow-up sessions with principals to develop planning, implementation, and evaluation strategies.

(5) Assessment data, as collected for Objective 2, was analyzed; and additional questionnaire was developed and distributed to the project participants after the completion of the project

(6) There was a significant increase in the participants' awareness of Community Education program possibilities, and measured by the assessment instruments.

(7) With the exception of planning and organization, participants demonstrated increased competency in all skill areas; supervisors concurred with this finding.

(8) Due to scheduling problems, the involvement of the superintendents was not possible at the level intended and was confined to interaction with individual participants at their respective sites on an informal basis.

(9) Evaluation was completed as planned; program was judged successful and recommendations were confined to session content and selection of resource people for sessions.

Project Title: Mid-Atlantic Consortium for LEA Short-Term Community Education Training (1976)

Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium Role Training Project (1977)

Institution: University of Virginia

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

1976

(1) To hold a five-day summer institute for 80 trainees who are either presently involved or planning to become involved in a system-wide or building-level effort for community education development.

(2) To establish ten ongoing community education training cluster groups to provide comprehensive regional short-term training for 250 trainees. Each cluster will meet a minimum of four times, for a total of 40 contact hours. Clusters will contain 15-35 participants.

(3) To provide trainees with instruction and learning experiences in 13 areas related to community education.

(4) To compile resource packets for all trainees.

1977

To provide a training (Role Training Project) that focuses on the role and specialized activities of different groups involved in community education development, through the use of peer training.

DESIGN:

1976

(1) Institute will include 55 current community education personnel and 25 persons new to the field. Sessions will include large-and small-group discussions, lectures and simulations. Emphasis will be on roles or role functions in community education leadership, models of community education, skills related to specific roles and problem-solving areas, and the clarification of local situations and problems in order to develop plans to provide necessary services.

(2) Training clusters will allow trainees to share local experiences and make application of newly-acquired skills over a period of time in their local communities. There will be eight units: philosophy and history of community education; community involvement; needs assessment and community resource inventory; K-12 integration; financial considerations in community education; evaluation procedures; major issues in community education. Trainees will develop action-oriented projects to be conducted throughout the year in the local community or school.

1977

(1) Initiate and implement a Participant Identification Process in each of the eight service areas of the region; select 120 participants to attend Role Training Academy.

(2) Plan and conduct a 3- day Role Training Academy focusing on the relationship of persons in 11 role groups in community education development, implementation, administration and evaluation.

(3) Develop and refine Role Training Process Guides for each of the 11 role groups; these will be used in local and state training workshops.

(4) Train a minimum of 440 persons in the 11 role groups at 24 local or state workshops (a minimum of 3 followup sessions to be held in each of the eight service areas) using the Role Training Process Guides.

(5) Plan and conduct a 5-day Role Training Followup Academy and Skill Building Institute for 100 participants drawn from the Academy, the local and state Role Training Workshops, and the Consortium Staff.

REPORTED RESULTS:

1976

(1) Institute held as planned for 149 participants.

(2) Ten clusters formed; all but one met a minimum of four times for 40+ contact hours; participation varied for 7 to 150 participants. All training clusters used the hours participants spent at the Institute as part of the total contact hours; if this had not been done, most of the groups would not have met 40 hours.

(3) 35 specific content and skill areas were offered to trainees.

(4) Over 50,000 individual pieces of literature were distributed to trainees; samples of packets were filed with the U.S.O.E. Office of Community Education.

1977

(1) Eleven peer teams (80 people) were brought together (superintendents; principals; community education coordinators; community college personnel; cooperative extension personnel; school board members; parks and recreation personnel; adult education personnel; handicapped/special education personnel; government agency officials; citizens and volunteers).

(2) Participants in first phase were used in their own states to work with others in their peer groups, assisting in both awareness sessions and indepth training for those already in the field (350 participants).

(3) Local sessions were also used to field test materials developed in Phase I.

(4) Peer teams from throughout the region were brought together to share information about successes and failures in peer training, and to participate in indepth training for their own professional advancement and growth. A final review of materials was also conducted at this session.

(5) Only 7 areas in the region participated, and only one area had teams in all eleven roles; four areas had only two or three teams.

Project Title: The Expansion and Improvement of Community Education Training Programs for Kentucky School Districts (1977)

Expanding Community Education Training Program and Opportunities for Persons in Kentucky School Districts and Communities (1978)

Institution: Western Kentucky University

GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

1977

(1) To develop specific training materials for each of several workshops on the basis of identified training needs.

(2) To plan, organize, and conduct two in-depth residential workshops for community education administrative personnel.

(3) To conduct on-site in-depth inservice training following each workshop for specialized needs of each project district.

(4) To arrange for visits by project participants to selected model community education programs.

(5) To plan and carry out a comprehensive process/product evaluation of the training product.

(6) To strengthen the Western Kentucky graduate program in community education by developing at least one additional course reflecting the concept and philosophy of community education.

(8) To prepare and disseminate a final report.

1978

(1) To conduct on-site training needs assessment in each project LEA and community.

(2) To conduct at least two planning sessions during the project year with the Western Kentucky University Advisory Committee for Community Education Development.

(3) To plan and conduct two in-depth residential workshops for selected community education leaders from each participating LEA and agency.

(4) To identify consultant assistance for each workshop.

(5) To coordinate training and technical assistance activities with the Department of Education.

(6) To identify two persons from each LEA and agency for participation in workshops I and II.

(7) To develop specific training materials for each workshop according to the identified needs.

(8) To identify participants from each LEA and community for on-site inservice training.

(9) To conduct on-site inservice training following each workshop for any specialized needs of project participants.

(10) To plan and coordinate four visits by project participants to selected model community education program sites.

(11) To conduct at least one in-depth inservice service seminar (one day) for selected persons involved in the Kentucky Network Team for Community Education Development.

(12) To administer the Concept Awareness and Readiness Test to randomly selected project participants.

(13) To plan and conduct a seminar on community education for Western Kentucky University Professional Development Network Commission (LEA superintendents, College of Education representatives, superintendents of area parochial schools).

(14) To conduct a process/product evaluation of the training project utilizing both formative and summative evaluation procedures.

(15) To prepare and disseminate a final report on project activities.

DESIGN:

1977

(1) Conduct needs assessment; review existing materials; develop new materials as needed; validate materials after training activity.

(2) Determine on-site training needs; review existing resources; develop needed resources; identify workshop personnel; schedule and conduct workshops.

(3) Review activities of workshops; review workshop evaluations; administer needs assessment to each participant; plan training activities for individual projects.

(4) Coordinate schedules between project participants and visitation site staff.

(5) Develop and test evaluation instruments; evaluate each activity; analyze findings; document results.

(6) Review existing courses; review literature; prepare course outline and proceed through university channels for approval.

(7) Collect and analyze all data from project activities; complete evaluation process; interpret and report outcomes of project activities.

1978

(1) Schedule visit to each project site; conduct needs assessments at project sites; analyze data.

(2) Schedule two meetings; select sites; prepare agendas and work items.

(3) Review needs assessments; identify training options; prepare training materials; conduct workshops.

(4) Review skills of key Kentucky community education leaders; identify needs; identify and contract for consultants; conduct orientation sessions for consultants.

(5) Schedule two meetings with State Coordinator; communicate with coordinator at least twice a month.

(6) Schedule meeting with LEA leadership; identify participants; secure commitments from participants for Workshops I, II.

(7) Review needs assessments; inventory existing training materials; develop materials needed; prepare materials for distribution.

(8) Meet with each LEA, agency or institution; review specific training needs of personnel; select participants.

(9) Review results of workshops; conduct second training needs assessment; prioritize needs; plan and conduct inservice.

(10) Select sites; schedule visits; coordinate activities of visits.

(11) Coordinate training activities with SEA coordinator; select seminar topic; schedule and conduct seminar.

(12) Select participants; administer CART: analyze data; report.

(13) Meet with PDC director; coordinate schedule of meeting; conduct seminar.

(14) Develop evaluation instruments; conduct evaluation after each activity; assess and analyze data; document and report results.

(15) Collect and analyze all data from project activities; complete evaluation; interpret and report outcomes.

CHAPTER IV:

ANALYSIS OF SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

A self-assessment instrument was used to determine project directors' perceptions of the relative importance and degree of delivery of 70 community competencies. This instrument was developed at Arizona State University under the terms of a Community Education grant (see Final Report, Competency-Based Assessment and Training Project, 1980).

The instrument was sent to all project directors; they were asked to rate only those competencies which applied to their specific projects. Directors of multiple-year projects were asked to complete a separate form for each year of funding. If a competency did not apply to a project, the director was instructed to mark "NA" and continue to the next competency statement. NA responses were dropped and mean scores for importance and delivery for each competency were based on the ratings given by directors whose projects included that competency.

Table V shows the mean importance (possible range of scores=1 to 3) and mean delivery (possible range of scores=1 to 7) scores for each competency.

Correlations between the importance of the competencies and the levels of delivery were computed for each project. The mean correlation for the 19 projects completing the instrument was .4961. Through conversations with project directors, it was found that projects with the most positive relationships between competency importance and delivery were those which had been altered the least during the negotation process.

TABLE V:

PROJECT DIRECTORS' SELF-ASSESSMENTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

I. In the area of COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT/INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING (R=1 to 3)	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING (R=1 to 7)
1. Recruit, involve, and encourage community participation.	17	2.82	4.82
2. Identify and work with different degrees of authority and power within the community.	17	2.59	3.82
3. Expand the community's understanding of the social and political forces that operate in the community.	17	2.53	3.59
4. Explain to members of community education council what is expected of individuals and of the group.	16	2.63	3.81
5. Organize and coordinate the work of a district community education council.	13	2.15	4.08
6. Develop leadership among community members.	18	2.89	3.67
7. Delegate power to people in the community.	17	2.53	3.35
8. Serve as a liaison between community schools and appropriate agencies and organizations.	16	2.75	4.06
9. Utilize available community resources for training and program development.	18	2.83	4.72
10. Advise and seek feedback from legislators about current education-related legislation.	7	2.43	3.86

II. In the area of COMMUNITY EDUCATION LEADERSHIP, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING
1. Exercise initiative in the implementation of goals, programs, and ideas.	16	2.81	4.63
2. Demonstrate appropriate and acceptable personal behavior and leadership style.	16	2.75	4.50
3. Use an effective and appropriate management system.	13	2.77	4.00
4. Establish structures for decision-making, problem-solving, and conflict resolution.	14	2.86	4.79
5. Accept responsibility for one's own actions and help others to learn to do the same.	13	2.54	4.23
6. Delegate responsibility.	14	2.57	3.93
7. Facilitate group or organizational change.	14	2.79	4.00
8. Help community and staff members learn problem-solving techniques.	15	2.67	4.53
9. Recognize, assess, and deal with risk situations.	12	2.25	3.42
10. Develop and use a plan for management of crisis.	11	1.91	3.36
11. Use time management techniques effectively.	11	1.73	3.55
12. Assess regularly personal strengths and weakness to develop a program for self-improvement.	13	2.00	3.69
13. Develop and achieve personal goals within the structure of the organization.	12	2.25	3.75
14. Develop and use consulting skills.	9	1.89	3.78

III. In the area of HUMAN RELATIONS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING
1. Communicate effectively with persons from all racial, socio-economic, cultural and occupational strata of the community.	17	2.59	3.47
2. Listen effectively to people.	18	2.61	3.44
3. Use both verbal and non-verbal communication techniques effectively.	16	2.44	3.38
4. Use group dynamics techniques.	19	2.68	4.79
5. Provide an organizational climate in which all members make significant contributions.	19	2.74	4.84
6. Use various methods to build desirable trust levels among community organizations, groups, and individuals.	19	2.68	4.47
IV. In the area of PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to			
1. Identify methods of dispersing information to appropriate publics.	15	2.27	3.93
2. Establish a public information program with a two-way flow of information and recommendations.	15	2.33	3.47
3. Build a public relations package.	14	1.93	3.43
4. Develop public and personal speaking skills.	10	1.90	3.00
5. Define board policy related to community education.	12	2.42	3.92
6. Prepare and present reports to the school board on community education.	13	1.92	2.77

V. In the area of COMMUNITY EDUCATION PERSONNEL, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING
1. Develop clear specifications for job descriptions.	11	1.64	2.45
2. Identify, recruit, and screen staff.	11	1.82	2.07
3. Assess staff needs and deliver appropriate inservice training.	14	2.00	3.43
4. Recruit and train volunteers.	14	2.50	4.14
5. Develop and implement a plan for the effective management of volunteers.	14	2.36	4.07
6. Promote the importance of staff accessibility.	9	2.33	3.67
VI. In the area of PROGRAM PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to			
1. Involve community people in setting goals to meet community needs.	18	2.89	5.22
2. Employ procedures for establishing organizational goals.	14	2.86	4.71
3. Develop policies and goals consistent with district philosophy and legal requirements.	14	2.57	4.00
4. Identify and organize program objectives.	17	2.71	4.82
5. Develop strategies for accomplishing goals and objectives.	18	2.67	4.61
6. Pursue and use innovative ideas.	17	2.59	4.35
7. Identify and coordinate resources for community use.	18	2.83	4.89

VII. In the area of COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING
1. Program activities, schedule programs, and supervise enrollment procedures to expedite organization of personnel and facilities.	12	2.17	3.08
2. Coordinate and schedule use of facilities with other administrators.	9	1.89	3.00
3. Maintain records of operations.	11	2.00	2.27
4. Select and maintain a library of pertinent materials.	7	2.00	3.43
VIII. In the area of COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to			
1. Develop, conduct, tabulate, and interpret needs assessments.	18	2.39	4.17
2. Plan and implement a program evaluation system.	15	2.53	3.67
3. Train building level directors and community groups in evaluation techniques.	13	2.08	2.46
4. Develop procedures to assess process effectiveness.	16	2.19	2.81
5. Evaluate student performance and participation.	8	2.25	2.25
6. Write evaluation reports and recommendations for future programs.	15	2.33	3.20

IX. In the area of FINANCE FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to	NO. OF PROJECTS RATING COMPET. AS APPLICABLE	MEAN SKILL IMPORTANCE RATING	MEAN SKILL DELIVERY RATING
1. Identify available funding sources.	18	2.50	4.50
2. Plan programs consistent with finance laws.	9	1.89	3.67
3. Prepare a workable budget.	14	2.29	4.07
4. Secure and administer funds acquired through grants.	12	2.33	3.75
5. Supervise and manage financial affairs.	11	1.64	3.18
6. Maintain an accurate financial record system.	14	1.93	3.93
X. In the area of RESEARCH IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION, to what extent did you deliver training? Skill: Ability to			
1. Identify relevant research in community education.	12	1.75	3.42
2. Apply professional research techniques and methods.	10	2.10	3.00
3. Use research results for decision-making and problem-solving.	14	1.93	3.07
4. Interpret research data for use by non-research people.	7	2.00	3.14
5. Develop and write research proposals.	7	2.14	4.14

Four rank orderings of competencies were compiled using mean scores: (1) most important competencies; (2) least important competencies; (3) competencies delivered to the greatest degree; and (4) competencies delivered to the least degree. In addition, lists were made of (1) competencies which were applicable to all projects, (2) competencies which were applicable to 18 of 19 projects, and (3) competencies which were applicable to less than half of the projects.

All projects included three competencies as part of their training: (1) the ability to use group dynamics techniques (III-4); (2) the ability to provide an organizational climate in which all members make significant contributions (III-5); and (3) the ability to use various methods to build desirable trust levels among community organizations, groups and individuals (III-6). These competencies are in task area III: Human Relations, and the fact that all training included these competencies suggests the importance with which that task area is viewed.

In addition, each of eight other competencies appear as a training component in all but one project (that is, each was reported by 18 of the 19 directors). Those are (in order of appearance on the instrument):

The ability to

1) develop leadership among community members (I-6)
2) utilize available community resources for training and program development (I-9)
3) listen effectively to people (III-2)
4) involve community people in setting goals to meet community needs (VI-1)
5) develop strategies for accomplishing goals and objectives (VI-5)
6) identify and coordinate resources for community use (VI-7)

7) develop, conduct, tabulate, and interpret needs assessments (VIII-1)

8) identify available funding sources (IX-1).

The task areas which do not appear as regular components of training are those of Community Education Leadership (II), Public Relations (IV), Community Education Personnel (V), Community Education Program Implementation (VIII), and Research in Community Education (X). Training in eight competencies in those areas was delivered in less than half of the projects. Those competencies are:

The ability to

1) advise and seek feedback from legislators about current education-related legislation (I-10)--training delivered by only 7 of 19 projects.

2) select and maintain a library of pertinent materials (VII-4)--training delivered by 7 of 19 projects.

3) interpret research data for use by non-research people (X-4)--training delivered by 7 of 19 projects.

4) develop and write research proposals (X-5)--training delivered by 7 of 19 projects.

5) evaluate student performance and participation (VIII-5)--training delivered by 8 of 19 projects.

6) develop and use consulting skills (II-14)--training delivered by 9 of 19 projects.

7) coordinate and schedule use of facilities with other administrators (VII-2)--training delivered by 9 of 19 projects.

8) plan programs consistent with finance laws (IX-2)--training delivered by 9 of 19 projects.

The presence or absence of a particular competency in a number of programs should not be viewed as either bad or good, advantageous or disadvantageous. It is only by comparing delivery to ratings of importance (as seen

by project directors) that we can begin to draw some conclusions about the effectiveness and appropriateness of federally-funded training. This comparison is presented in Chapter VI of this report.

CHAPTER V:
COMPARISON OF
A SINGLE-YEAR PROJECT AND A MULTIPLE-YEAR PROJECT

The data in Table I (Chapter I) show that 11 of 27 projects supported by Community Education monies were refunded for a second or third year. Initial comparison of multiply-funded projects seemed to indicate that they differed from single-year projects in their implementation procedures and results. Because this was an interesting phenomenon worthy of further investigation, on-site observations and participant interviews were conducted for two representative ongoing projects--one a single-year project and one a multiple-year project.

Two one-year projects were funded in 1979-80: Arizona State University ("Training for Planning") and the University of Maryland ("Citizen Effectiveness Training"). For accessibility and economic reasons the ASU project was chosen as the single-year project to be studied. Two multiple-year projects were also funded in 1979-80: Oklahoma State University and California State University, Sacramento ("I.D.E.A."). Because of accessibility and, more important, because its project represented the third <u>continuous</u> year of funding, the California State project was chosen for further examination. Brief descriptions of the information collected during site visits follow.

SINGLE-YEAR FUNDING: ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY (1979)

This project implemented a training program focused on long-range planning in community education. Its content and methods were intended specifically to develop the capacity of districts to continue to plan and to help others to plan after the conclusion of funding. Training was delivered to teams of educators from districts in three states (Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona) who attended a series of workshops emphasizing specific planning skills. During the training period (approximately nine months), each team was expected to develop a three- to five-year plan for the expansion of community education in their area. Additional goals of the project were to develop the abilities of team members to train others in their communities in planning for community education, and to prepare and disseminate training materials in planning for community education.

The training was highly successful for the teams who maintained their involvement with the project. However, because notification of funding came so close to the intended starting date for the project several problems arose:

1) Recruitment was not as extensive or selective as it might otherwise have been, and some of the teams initially invited to participate did not feel a strong commitment to the project.

2) The orientation of participants (including project staff and consultants) was not as comprehensive as was originally intended and, therefore, the training sometimes lacked an overall consistency.

3) The operational problems involved in scheduling

the training had to be dealt with as the project progressed rather than prior to implementation, which took time away from monitoring and evaluation activities.

As with most of the one-year projects, the development of a structured plan for facilitating communication among the various components was more difficult than anticipated. Various strategies were attempted and a workable system finally emerged near the end of the project year.*

MULTIPLE-YEAR FUNDING: CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (1977-79)

During the first year of this project, the emphasis was on the development of a one-year, field-based graduate program in community education, designed primarily for professional educators. As with most first-year projects, notification of funding arrived so close to the project's starting date that scheduling concerns overrode planning needs, and several problems developed:

1. There was not enough time to recruit the type of people who would benefit most from this experience and, therefore, some of the interns did not find the program compatible with their needs. Those interns eventually withdrew from the program.

2. There was not enough time available for careful identification, recruitment, and training of field supervisors and other staff and, therefore, individuals did not all share a common understanding of the project's goals. This affected the content and consistency of the training experiences.

3. Full-time professional educators could not complete the requirements of the degree program within the time frame of the project. Attempts to do so caused

*For further information on this project, see the Final Report, which includes an evaluation of the process of training.

interns to limit time spent on planning or evaluating their experiences in favor of more product-oriented activities.

The development of an efficient communications network linking the community and the university was another major concern of the project, and various methods were tried and evaluated. As part of their internships, the graduate students conducted needs assessments in several communities. This information was analyzed to determine what classes and activities the university could provide for the people in those areas. Near the end of the first year, the classes were made available, and local community members were hired to teach a variety of subjects. In spite of the fact that there was no time for the orientation and training of the lay teachers, these classes proved to be the most successful aspect of the project, since they provided high visibility to the linkage system being established between the community and the university.

Another approach which was begun during the first year involved offering staff of agencies individualized short-term training designed to meet their identified needs. The training was developed and delivered by university project staff at the request of a community agency or organization. Initial trainees included elementary school aides, student government officers, and day camp counselors.

In addition to moving the university into the community, efforts were made to bring the community onto the campus. Tours were arranged for public school students, and the numerous logistical problems that arose were carefully documented and analyzed. By the end of the first year, the various attempts to integrate the university

and the community had been evaluated and solutions to most of the major problems had been developed.

Although the initial difficulties with the internship program had been alleviated, a new problem arose during the second year: due to changes in the state plan for school financing, monies for community education had declined and many educators began to look for other options. When it became apparent that few new interns would be entering the program, the project staff redirected its efforts toward further development of the university-community relationship.

The project staff moved their offices into a storefront facility in the community, and began an extensive publicity campaign designed to promote the individualized training component of the project. Since the procedures for developing such training had been refined and formalized at the end of the first year, the staff was easily able to handle the resulting increase in requests for such services.

In addition, the student tours of the university were expanded to include a Saturday program called "Kids on Campus." This was a five-week series of tuitioned classes requested by and developed for children aged 6 through 13. The classes were held on the university campus, with local community members involved as salaried instructors. By the end of the second year, adult classes had also been added. The "Kids on Campus" program proved so successful that the project staff made that component their primary focus for the third year.

Although the internship program had never developed as originally planned, and therefore received little attention at this point, the short-term individualized training component had been extremely well-received by the community. The university sought to reduce its direct involvement in

that training without affecting its successful continuation; therefore, the project staff organized model community task forces and trained the members to develop and deliver individualized packages, as well as to coordinate and evaluate the overall operation of the program. Consequently, by the end of the third year of funding this component was totally under the supervision of the community task forces.

The expansion of the "Kids on Campus" project began with the development of a teen executive council. The student members of this council received training in planning processes and related skills, and were gradually incorporated into the "Kids on Campus" administrative system. The program itself was further expanded to include a summer component which attracted over 700 participants and provided paid internships for dozens of university education students.

By the end of the third year the program had enough community support to become a self-sustaining, non-profit corporation. The university had become a community school.

A COMPARISON

In comparing the accomplishments of single-year and multiple-year projects, several conclusions become apparent:

1) Many of the start-up problems occurring in the first year of funding seem to be unavoidable. These problems cut down on the amount of time actually available for implementation of the project during that year. In order to meet the most visible commitments in the proposals (i.e., "goals and objectives"), projects often curtail planning and evaluation efforts in favor of product development. Therefore, single-year funding seems most appropriate for the quantitative testing and comparisons of training

procedures, processes, and products, while the significant development and modification of training packages seems to require more than one year.

2) The time constraints of single-year funding discourage project personnel from developing creative solutions to problems or expanding projects in innovative directions. A multiple-year project can afford to risk failure, since there is time to make corrections and redirect efforts.

3) Although the intent of many projects is to have a long-range impact on the growth and development of community education in their respective areas, single-year funding does not permit follow-up activities designed to monitor the participants' abilities to maintain and use newly-acquired skills without continued training support. Multiple-year funding allows trainers to observe the post-project effects of training and determine the relative value not only of the training content but also of the procedures used during the training process.

In conclusion, single-year projects had merit and success when the effort was specific in both content and outcomes. More generic developmental activities, however, seemed to required multiple-year funding in order to allow for the evolution of successful approaches without the encumbrance of one-year deadlines. Of course, all "multiple-year" projects were in reality successive one-year projects and therefore were constrained by year-to-year funding and reporting*; the data available suggest that assured multiple-year funding may further enhance the ability of projects to initiate and carry out comprehensive developmental efforts.

*Institutions which received funding in non-successive years were not considered "multiple-year" projects in this analysis.

CHAPTER VI:
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data presented in this report lead to several conclusions and suggest some recommendations for improving training in community education. These conclusions come directly from both the quantitative and qualitative data available; conclusions also appear as data from this report are compared to information and recommendations from other seminars on training.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SELF-ASSESSMENTS

Chapter IV reported the data from the directors' self-assessments, and listed competencies which were frequently or infrequently delivered in funded training projects. An analysis of the reported discrepancies between importance and delivery of training is also necessary, for it illuminates those areas which are over- or under-emphasized.

Tables VI and VII list the competency areas where training was or was not delivered, and compare that information to rankings of importance. Examination of the data in the tables shows that high importance competencies were often included in training (64%). However, low-importance competencies appear to have been delivered more frequently than their importance might warrant.

The major discrepancies emerging from the self-assessment data are:

1) Developing leadership among community members (I-6) was rated the most important competency, but training was not focused on that area.

2) Planning and goalsetting were considered important, yet significant parts of that process (VI-2: Organizational goals; and II-3: Management system) were not

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANCE AND TRAINING DELIVERY[1]

Competencies Delivered to Greatest Degree (Rank Ordered)[2]	Competencies Rated Most Important (Rank Ordered)[3]
VI-1 Involve commun, goal-setting	I-6 Community leadership
VI-7 Resource identification	VI-1 Involve community, goal-setting
III-5 Organizational climate	II-4 Decision making
I-1 Community participation	VI-2 Organizational goals
VI-4 Program objectives	I-9 Resource use
III-4 Group dynamics	VI-7 Resource identification
II-4 Decision making	I-1 Community participation
I-9 Resource use	II-1 Initiative in implementation
VI-2 Establishing goals	II-7 Facilitate change
II-1 Initiative in implementation	II-3 Management system
VI-5 Strategies for goal accomplishment	I-8 Liaison
II-8 Problem solving	II-2 Leadership style
IX-1 Funding sources	III-5 Organizational climate
II-2 Leadership style	VI-4 Program objectives

[1]Underlined competencies are those where importance rating and delivery level are similar. For full statement of competency, see instrument in Chapter IV, Table V.

[2]Range of delivery scores M = 5.22 to 4.50 (possible R=7)

[3]Range of importance scores M = 2.89 to 2.71 (possible R=3)

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANCE AND TRAINING DELIVERY

Competencies Delivered to Least Degree (Rank Ordered)[1]	Competencies Rated Least Important (Rank Ordered)[2]
V-2 Staffing	V-1 Job descriptions
VIII-5 Student evaluation	IX-5 Financial management
VII-3 Record keeping	II-11 Time management
V-1 Job descriptions	X-1 Identify research
VIII-3 Training in evaluation	V-2 Staffing
IV-6 Reports	II-14 Consulting skills
VIII-4 Process evaluation	VII-2 Facility use

[1]Range of delivery scores $\bar{M}$ = 2.07 to 2.81 (possible R=7)

[2]Range of importance scores $\bar{M}$ = 1.64 to 1.78 (possible R=3)

high-priority training areas.

3) Training may have overemphasized:
   a) the identification of funding sources (IX-1) and financial management (IX-5);
   b) group dynamics (III-4);
   c) teaching problem-solving (II-8);
   d) facility use (VII-2);
   e) time management (II-11);
   f) consulting skills (II-14); and
   g) identifying research (X-1).

4) Training may have underemphasized:
   a) developing community leadership (I-6);
   b) facilitating change (II-7);
   c) developing a management system (II-3);
   d) serving as a liaison (I-8);
   e) recordkeeping (VIII-3) and reporting (IV-6); and
   f) evaluation (VIII-3; VIII-4; VIII-5).

The word "may" is emphasized in statements (3) and (4) above because the numerical discrepancy scores for some of these items often were not very great. Indeed, numerically the largest discrepancies occurred with the following competencies (ranked in order of discrepancy, with the largest score first):

II-8: Help community members and staff learn problem-solving techniques (high importance-low delivery).

V-1: Develop clear and specific job descriptions (lowest importance-some delivery).

VII-4: Select and maintain pertinent library of materials (lowest importance-some delivery).

VIII-5: Evaluate student performance and participation (no delivery-some importance).

IX-1: Identify available funding sources (more importance than delivery).

X-5: Develop and write research proposals (non-applicable or low importance, but delivered to a high degree).

Reviewing these discrepancies suggests several conclusions or recommendations:

1) By and large, training was delivered so as to address competencies that project directors felt were important.

2) The competencies which project directors felt were important (or unimportant) are not necessarily rated similarly by other populations. For example, when the same instrument was completed by community education leaders about training in general, the most important competencies were (in order);

a) process evaluation (VIII-4)
b) community power and authority (I-2)
c) decisionmaking structures (II-4)
d) research procedures (X-2)
e) social/political understanding (I-3)
f) budgeting (IX-3)
g) public information program (IV-2)
h) management system (II-3)
i) communication (III-1)
j) development of community leadership (I-6).

Of these ten competencies, only three had a high importance rating among project directors, and only one was among the "top 14" competencies for which training was often delivered as shown in Table VIII. The information in Table VIII indicates either that project directors did not perceive training needs as did the larger population, and thus structured their projects to meet what they felt were needed competencies or that the training delivered over the course of four years of federal funding has been addressed to training needs which previously existed, but which no longer are perceived as important. Lacking

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF COMPETENCY RATINGS

Competency Rated Important in National Study (Rating by Mean Score)[1]	Competency Rated Important by Project Directors (Rating by Mean Score)	Competency Included as One of the "Top 14" Training Components (Degree/Delivery)
VIII-4	---	---
I-2	---	---
II-4	X	X (#7)
X-2	---	---
I-3	---	---
IX-3	---	---
IV-2	---	---
II-3	X	---
III-1	---	---
I-6	X	---[2]

[1]See "Final Report, Competency-Based Assessment and Training Project" Southwest Center for Community Education Development, Arizona State University, 1980.

[2]Not in "Top 14" but included in 18 of 19 projects.

further information, we can make no decision about which of these alternatives is more accurate since, certainly, arguments can be made for both of them.

3) Competencies in research and evaluation appear regularly as important areas, yet little to no training is being done. This may reflect a belief that practitioners do not need these skills, or it may reflect trainers' inability to deliver these skills. In any case, future training programs should incorporate research and evaluation skills as an integral part of their design.

4) Training in planning and goal-setting is strong, yet there is little training in the necessary follow-up to planning--evaluation. That is, planning is not seen as a holistic process, but rather as simply a piece of programming. Training in planning in the future should incorporate an evaluation component (see recommendation 3, above).

5) More training is needed in developing leadership, decision-making skills, and problem-solving skills. These competencies are ones which especially lend themselves to creative, developmental projects.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PROPOSALS AND REPORTS, AND FROM CASE STUDIES

The qualitative data also define several conclusions and recommendations. Most conclusions about training content come out of the quantitative (self-assessment) data, but the qualitative data provide additional support for needed training in two areas: long-range planning, and decision making. Only one project addressed long-range planning specifically, and even that project experienced some difficulty in that training. Other projects delivered

training in setting short-range (one- to three-year) goals and objectives and in implementing those goals and objectives.

It is clear, then, that more training in long-range planning processes is needed. Certainly, that kind of training is a difficult proposition, particularly for districts and agencies where funding is a year-to-year phenomenon. However, it is precisely this uncertainty of funding which makes long-range, contingency-oriented planning critical so that community educators can begin to deal with larger, community-wide problems and programs.

The second important area where training was not delivered was citizen decision making. This area was frequently a planned component of training, but it was often omitted during training or rated as one of the least successful training areas. This problem is not surprising, for teaching decision making is difficult, and few materials are available which are developed specifically for community-level decision making. Decision making, along with long-range planning, are training areas where developmental efforts should be concentrated in the future.

Conclusions and recommendations for project design also emerge from a review of project proposals, final reports, and case studies. Among those are:

1) Audiences. Projects began to address varied audiences during the later years of funding. This diversity should be encouraged and supported.

2) Funding cycle. Funding has usually been at the convenience of the federal government, corresponding to the federal fiscal year rather than to the recipients' fiscal years. This does not allow for the lead time and flexibility necessary for comprehensive planning and

management, only some of which can be done in the proposal preparation stage. The federal office should allow for alternative starting dates, or the writers of proposals should consider that project years are usually incompatible with most school years, and thus plan explicitly only for five or six months of training activity, the remaining time being used for planning, evaluation and dissemination. The funding cycle is especially difficult for projects which are developmental in nature. Thus, multiple-year funding should focus on these developmental programs (see conclusion 3, below).

3) Project type. Two major types of projects were funded: model-testing and developmental projects. The former do not, by their nature, require long-term funding, for the projects tend to focus on validating either a training approach or a training product. The latter, however, involve a longer-term commitment by the institution. Funding decisions should recognize this distinction and should reflect criteria that take into account the time and money which is, realistically, necessary for a final product.

4) Staffing. Projects which employed paid staff, including graduate assistants, experienced more successful training than did projects which used volunteer staff. The developers and evaluators of proposals should keep this in mind as they determine budgets for projects. Further, an examination of why volunteers are less effective as staff should be undertaken in order to determine whether there is a feasible and effective way to employ volunteers.

5) Sessions. Projects offering multiple-day sessions once or twice during the year had better attendance and reported greater participant satisfaction than did projects with many one-day workshops. This should be kept in mind as other training projects are developed.

6) Project evaluation. Minimum standards for project evaluation were not established by the federal government, either in terms of evaluation design or of implementation, and this led to inadequate project evaluation. Criteria for evaluation design (including who will evaluate and what they will evaluate) should be specified and used in funding decisions. Funding should include money to support the quality of evaluation that can provide information to improve other training projects; moreover, money designated for evaluation should be used for that purpose only, and the federal office should monitor this.

Project evaluations should concentrate on assessing the process and implications of training rather than on the "what" and "who." Recommendatons for replication and/or revision, along with other analyses of processes and procedures, should be an integral part of the evaluation report. Further, evaluation findings should be disseminated so as to improve training in other locales (see conclusion 8). It is especially important that comprehensive evaluations be conducted on multiple-year projects, since those projects appear best able to collect qualitative data for such assessments.

7) Follow-up. Although there were provisions for follow-up in many project proposals, these were generally not carried out. That is, projects were judged successful strictly on the basis of whether or not the

participants learned what was taught, but there was no determination of whether participants could apply what they had learned and make substantive differences in their schools and communities. Activities to monitor application of training should be included in both project designs and evaluation designs in the future.

8) Dissemination. Even successful projects were limited in their national impact because of poor dissemination of results/products. In some cases this lack of dissemination was a result of federal decisions; when negotiations removed dissemination funds from budgets there was no money left to engage in that somewhat expensive endeavor. In at least one case a camera-ready training product was filed for several years at the federal office until funds were found to publish a limited number of the manuals.

However, the lack of dissemination was also the directors' responsibility; where money was not available for product dissemination activities, even presentations at national conferences or brief descriptions of results were unavailable to other trainers. Moreover, some projects did not develop the materials which they had stated they would. Thus, training designs were sometimes repeated by other projects, difficulties in training implementation reoccurred, and training products were not generally available. It is critical, if training is to improve, that dissemination of reports of activities and of training materials be required, supported, and monitored.

CONCLUSION

Those who develop and carry out projects always work with background information that is somewhat limited and almost always subjective. The focus of training often depends on what a few local community educators perceive as needed or, alternatively, on what the staff of the federal Office of Community Education perceive as important. It is therefore unjustified to judge the effectiveness of funded training projects against some national norm or assessment since, at the time these projects were developed, that information was not available.*

Rather, a final "evaluation" of projects should relate what actually happened to what the federal government explicitly stated should happen. In September, 1977, after a year of funding, the federal office held a national seminar to address the question of what training and curriculum development activities should be supported. Participants at that seminar suggested six areas or approaches where training should be concentrated: (1) development of alternative training delivery systems; (2) impact on teacher training programs; (3) development of both preservice and inservice graduate-level programs; (4) emphasis on practical application in training; (5) (5) development of training in citizen involvement; and (6) dissemination. Of these six areas only one--dissemination--appears as a serious weakness in the projects.

---

*Reference to a national norm also negates federal rules and regulations which specify that training should address local needs.

The other five areas were reflected in projects in 1977-80, demonstrating that projects were attempting to be responsive to explicit guidelines and ideas emanating from the federal level.

It is also unjustified to condemn training projects for lack of coordination or consistency, or for their failure to develop a national training presence since information for such coordination was not available and activity to enhance that coordination was not supported. Funding guidelines for the new Community Schools Act, however, support collaborative efforts, and should encourage the exchange of information and the development of collaborative efforts which are necessary to ensure the improvement of community education training.

In summary, while there were weaknesses in projects funded under the first Community Schools Act, there appears to have been real progress made in addressing needed competencies and in developing responsive training designs. This is particularly true given the limited funding available during this period. The record is encouraging: there is every reason to believe the progress made to date, in conjunction with the new federal emphasis on coordination and dissemination, can provide a solid base for continuing to improve the development and implementation of training for community education.